

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

A-6727 (191910-1800)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Typed or printed name \_\_\_\_\_

Application Number

09/976,604

Filed

October 12, 2001

First Named Inventor

Penk, et al.

Art Unit

2143

Examiner

England, David E.

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☐ attorney or agent of record. \_\_\_\_\_  
Registration number \_\_\_\_\_

☒ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. \_\_\_\_\_  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 58,169

/ BAB /

Signature

Benjamin A. Balser

Typed or printed name

(770) 933-9500

Telephone number

August 7, 2007

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.  
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☐ \*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

## Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In Re Application of:

Penk, et al.

Serial No.: 09/976,604

Filed: October 12, 2001

Confirmation No.: 3301

Group Art Unit: 2143

Examiner: England, Dave E.

Docket No.: A-6727 (191910-1800)

For: Mechanism for Implementing Network Discovery in a Cable Network

**REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF**  
**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant submits the following remarks in support of a Request for a Pre-Appeal Brief  
Conference.

## **REMARKS**

Applicant submits that the following clear legal and factual deficiency exists in the rejection. Namely, the previous Office Action equates "including an IP address" with "assigning a unique identifier to a transport stream of a plurality of transport streams," which are two functions that are known to be technically very different from each other. Even if the cited reference, *Teraoka*, discloses movement transparency in which "an IP address (location designator) is supplemented by a [virtual Internet protocol] VIP address that is introduced as an identifier specific to each host computer, *Teraoka* fails to disclose "assigning a unique identifier to a transport stream of a plurality of transport streams." Additionally, the Office Action uses an obviousness standard in the analysis of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

### **I. Status**

Claims 44-48, 51-54, 59-64, and 66-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Teraoka* (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,836). Claims 49, 50, 55-58, and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Teraoka* in view of *Rao* (U.S. Patent No. 6,789,118).

### **II. Rejections of Independent Claim 59 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Independent claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Teraoka* (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,836).

Independent claim 59 recites:

59. A method of mapping a digital network, the method comprising:  
*assigning a unique transport stream identifier to each transport stream of a plurality of transport streams, wherein the plurality of transport streams are transmitted from a plurality of devices included in the digital network and wherein each device of the plurality of devices transmits a plurality of transport streams;*

associating each assigned unique transport stream identifier with a particular device of the plurality of devices, wherein the particular device transmits the transport stream having the unique transport stream identifier assigned thereto;

transmitting to each device of the plurality of devices an assigned unique transport stream identifier associated therewith;

receiving a network message from multiple devices of the plurality of devices, each network message including at least one input transport stream identifier; and

using the multiple network messages to determine a hierarchy of devices for the plurality of devices.

(Emphasis added.)

*Teraoka* fails to disclose **assigning a unique transport stream identifier to each transport stream of a plurality of transport streams, wherein the plurality of transport streams are transmitted from a plurality of devices included in the digital network and wherein each device of the plurality of devices transmits a plurality of transport streams.**

Although *Teraoka* appears to disclose some types of identifiers, it seems that the identifiers represent IP addresses, including starting and ending points. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, the IP addresses of *Teraoka* disclose device identifiers, the end points of the transport stream do not identify the transport streams themselves. Multiple transports streams, each with a unique transport stream ID, may be transported between two particular IP addresses. All such transport streams transmitted between two IP addresses in the system disclosed by *Teraoka* will have those same IP addresses assigned. However, per the instant claim, each of the multiple transport streams between two particular IP addresses has a unique transport stream ID.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that *Teraoka* fails to disclose claim 59 and the claim should be allowed.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action, the Office Action alleges that the cited element is disclosed “in column 5 of *Teraoka*[, where] it is stated, ‘where, ‘VIPaddr\_A’ stands for the VIP address of the computer A and ‘port\_A’ for the **port number assigned when ‘VendPoint\_A’ was generated by the computer A.** The same holds for ‘VIPaddr\_B’ and ‘port\_B.’” *Final Office Action*, page 10, section 32 (no emphasis added). It is clear that this only discloses identifying the end point devices of a transport stream, and not the unique transport streams themselves.

Additionally, the Office Action states that “[t]he other limitation is already discussed in the above response to the remarks and can be applied here.” *Final Office Action*, page 10, section 32. As the exact section in which this limitation is discussed is not easily identified, Applicant has assumed that the Office Action is referring to sections 26-28 in which a device identifier, an input transport stream identifier, and an output transport stream identifier is discussed. In section 28, the Office Action states that “[t]he conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.” Claim 59, along with all other independent claims, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, which requires that the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant respectfully submits that an obviousness analysis using common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art is immaterial to an anticipation analysis under 35 U.S.C. §102. Therefore, not only does *Teraoka* fail to disclose the cited claim language, but, also, an improper analysis was used in formulating the rejection. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

***CONCLUSION***

For at least the reasons set forth above, favorable reconsideration and allowance, or the re-opening of prosecution on the merits of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER  
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

/BAB/

**Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 58,169**

100 Galleria Parkway, NW  
Suite 1750  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948  
Tel: (770) 933-9500  
Fax: (770) 951-0933